

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-24 were previously pending in the application. Claims 1 and 17 are amended herein. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the October 14, 2010, Advisory Office Action, the Examiner indicated claims 7 and 21-24 as objected to but directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 8-10, which depend variously from claim 7, were not addressed in the Advisory Office Action. In a Telephonic Interview with the Examiner on October 22, 2010, the Examiner clarified that claims 8-10 should have been indicated as objected to but directed to allowable subject matter. The Examiner also stated that the Examiner would issue an Interview Summary and a supplemental Advisory Action indicating the corrected status of the claims.

### **Prior-Art Rejections**

In the Advisory Office Action, the Examiner maintained the rejections of claims 1-6 and 11-20. These claims were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,904,462 to Sinha (“Sinha”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,046,665 to Walrand et al. (“Walrand”). For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

### **Claims 1 and 17**

In rejecting the previously pending claim 1, the Examiner argued that the proposed combination of Sinha and Walrand would disclose all the elements of the previously pending claim 1. In order to remove a potential ambiguity, the Applicant has amended claims 1 and 17 to recite “representing ... for each link in the network and each node and each other link in the network....” In the Interview of October 22, 2010, the Examiner indicated that the cited references do not disclose this feature in combination with the other features of amended claim 1.

The Applicant submits that, on those grounds alone, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The Applicant submits that the cited references do not disclose all the recited features of amended claim 1. In particular, the Applicant submits that the cited references do not disclose the feature of “representing, in a network data structure, information associated with a mesh network . . ., wherein the network data structure comprises, for each link in the network and each node and each other link in the network, a representation of a minimum amount of protection bandwidth required to be reserved on said each link to restore service upon failure of said each node or other link.”

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 17 is also allowable over the cited references. Since claims 2-16 and 21-24 depend variously from claim 1, and claims 18-20 depend variously from claim 17, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over the cited references.

#### Claims 12 and 16

The Applicant notes that, while the Examiner asserted that claim 12 recites “an incremental version of the network data structure,” claim 12 actually recites “a compact version of the network data structure.” Similarly, while the Examiner asserted that claim 16 recites “a compact version of the network data structure,” claim 16 actually recites “an incremental version of the network data structure.” The Applicant will regard the rejections as directed at the proper elements. The Applicant further notes that the Examiner did not address the Applicant’s arguments regarding claims 12 and 16 in the Responses.

In rejecting previously presented claim 12, the Examiner asserted that the proposed combination of Sinha and Walrand would disclose all the elements of claim 12, including “a compact version of the network data structure.” The Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach this feature.

The Examiner cited Sinha at column 2, lines 58-64, as specifically teaching this feature. The cited section discloses that one Sinha embodiment is designed to determine protection-path allocation to reduce designation of additional protection-path bandwidth. Neither the cited section nor any other section of Sinha discloses anything about a compact version of a network

data structure. Consequently, it cannot be said that the proposed combination would teach the above-quoted feature.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that this provides further grounds for the allowability of claim 12 over the cited references. For similar reasons, the Applicant also submits that this also provides further grounds for the allowability of claim 16. Since claims 13-15 depend from claim 12, it is further submitted that this also provide further grounds for the allowability of those claims over the cited references.

#### Claim 14

In rejecting previously presented claim 14, the Examiner asserted that the proposed combination of Sinha and Walrand would teach all the features of claim 14, including that “the compact representation is a node aggregate vector  $V_{na}$  wherein each element of  $V_{na}$  corresponds to a node in the network” (emphasis added). The Applicant submits that the proposed combination would not teach this feature. The Applicant notes that the Examiner did not address the Applicant’s arguments regarding claim 14 in the Responses.

The Examiner cited Sinha at column 4, line 4 – column 5, line 9, as specifically allegedly teaching this feature. As noted above in reference to claim 1, Sinha does not teach any vector whose elements correspond to nodes in the network. However, the above-quoted feature requires that each element of the claimed vector correspond to a node in the network. Consequently, it cannot be said that the proposed combination teaches this feature of claim 14.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that this provides further grounds for the allowability of claim 14 over the cited references.

#### Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Fees

During the pendency of this application, the Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment of any filing fees for presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17 or credit any overpayment to **Mendelsohn, Drucker, & Associates, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-0782.**

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time if not submitted with the reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 1, 2010

Customer No. 46850  
Mendelsohn, Drucker, & Associates, P.C.  
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Edward J. Meisarosh/

Edward J. Meisarosh  
Registration No. 57,463  
Attorney for Applicant  
(215) 599-3639 (phone)  
(215) 557-8477 (fax)